

Genetic basis and fitness correlates of dynamic carotenoid-based ornamental colouration in male and female common kestrels *Falco tinnunculus*

Pablo Vergara§, Juan A. Fargallo, Jesús Martínez-Padilla*

Departamento de Ecología Evolutiva, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales-CSIC, José
Gutiérrez Abascal 2, 28006. Madrid, Spain.

§ PV deceased 7th of August 2013.

*** Corresponding author:** jmartinezapadilla12@gmail.com

Fax: +34 91 564 50 78.

Short running title: Carotenoid colouration: Genetics and selection

Abstract

Knowledge of the genetic basis of sexual ornaments is essential to understand their evolution through sexual selection. Although carotenoid-based ornaments have been instrumental in the study of sexual selection, given the inability of animals to synthesize carotenoids *de novo*, they are generally assumed to be influenced solely by environmental variation. However, very few studies have directly estimated the role of genes and the environment in shaping variation in carotenoid-based traits. Using long-term individual-based data, we here explore the evolutionary potential of a dynamic, carotenoid-based ornament (namely skin colouration), in male and female common kestrels. We first estimate the amount of genetic variation underlying variation in hue, chroma and brightness. After correcting for sex differences, the chroma of the orange-yellow eye ring colouration was significantly heritable ($h^2 \pm se = 0.40 \pm 0.17$), whereas neither hue ($h^2=0$) nor brightness ($h^2=0.02$) was heritable. Second, we estimate the strength and shape of selection acting upon chromatic (hue and chroma) and achromatic (brightness) variation, and show positive and negative directional selection on female but not male chroma and hue, respectively, whereas brightness was unrelated to fitness in both sexes. This suggests that different components of carotenoid-based signals traits may show different evolutionary dynamics. Overall, we show that carotenoid-based coloration is a complex and multifaceted trait. If we are to gain a better understanding of the processes responsible for the generation and maintenance of variation in carotenoid-based coloration, these complexities need to be taken into account.

Keywords: animal model, direct benefits, heritability, good genes, female ornamentation, parental care, sexual selection.

INTRODUCTION

Predicting the evolutionary dynamics of a trait requires knowledge of the relative importance of additive genetic variation in shaping phenotypic variation (i.e. its heritability), as well as of how it is related to fitness. This is particularly relevant within the context of sexual selection, as heritable variation in sexual ornamentation is a prerequisite for models of sexual selection based on indirect (genetic) benefits of mate choice (Qvarnström et al., 2006). Models based on direct (non-genetic) benefits of mate choice, on the other hand, such as an increased parental care or reduced parasite transmission between mates (Martinez-Padilla et al., 2012), do not require additive genetic variation to explain trait variation, and may be more applicable to ornaments that are shaped by environmental sources of variation (Evans & Sheldon, 2012).

Among the variety of secondary sexual traits that can be found in nature, ornamental colouration is among the most diverse and well studied subjects in evolutionary ecology (Hill & McGraw, 2006), playing a key role in pre- and post-mating sexual selection (Helfenstein et al., 2010, Mehlis et al., 2013). Although a plethora of studies has suggested a main role for sexual selection in explaining the evolution and maintenance of ornamental colourations in a wide variety of taxa (Hill & McGraw, 2006, Boughman, 2001, Endler, 1995, Maan & Cummings, 2009, Roulin & Ducrest, 2013), we still know remarkable little about their quantitative genetic basis (Evans & Sheldon, 2012, Mundy, 2006, Fitze et al., 2003). In birds, for example, our knowledge is restricted to a handful of study systems and is strongly biased towards melanin-based colouration and un-pigmented white patches, mostly in passerines (reviewed by Mundy, 2006), with some notable exceptions focusing on carotenoid or structural-based colours (Johnsen et al., 2003, Evans & Sheldon, 2012, Hadfield et al., 2006, Hadfield et al., 2007, Roulin & Ducrest, 2013).

64

65 The scarcity of studies addressing the quantitative genetics of carotenoid-based coloration can
66 at least partly be attributed to the fact that they are often assumed to be fully environment-
67 dependent (McGraw, 2006). Indeed, as vertebrates cannot synthesize carotenoids themselves,
68 they have to be acquired through their diet (McGraw, 2006). In line with this, a number of
69 studies have shown that the environment is an important source of variation in carotenoid-
70 based colouration (Endler, 1995, Hill, 2006). Importantly however, this does not rule out a
71 role for genes in shaping variation in carotenoid-based coloration (Olson & Owens, 2005,
72 Pérez-Rodríguez, 2008, Evans & Sheldon, 2012). For example, variation in foraging
73 behaviour or in the physiological machinery needed to internally process carotenoids can be
74 heritable traits (see Evans & Sheldon, 2012 and references there-in), generating additive
75 genetic variation in carotenoid-based coloration.

76

77 Understanding the evolutionary dynamics of carotenoid-based traits not only requires
78 knowledge of the quantitative genetic architecture of carotenoid-based traits, however, but
79 also of the form and strength of selection acting upon them. Under natural conditions, it is
80 well-established that enhanced expression of carotenoid-based coloration is beneficial on both
81 a behavioural and physiological level. For example, brighter coloration has been shown to be
82 a proxy of enhanced reproductive output and higher survival probability (Simons et al., 2012,
83 Horak et al., 2001). Furthermore, colouration may be associated with different reproductive or
84 mating strategies (Badyaev & Hill, 2002) and maternal allocation (Giraudeau et al., 2011). On
85 a physiological level, the immuno-stimulant and antioxidant properties of carotenoid have
86 been well established. Therefore, carotenoid-based ornaments may signal an individual's
87 capacity to fight parasites, as well as its immune function and antioxidant capacities

(Helfenstein et al., 2010, Mougeot, 2008, Martinez-Padilla et al., 2007, Horak et al., 2001, Mougeot et al., 2010b, Mougeot et al., 2010a).

Whereas male ornamentation has been subject of intense study over the past decades, there has been little interest in female ornamentation. This has recently changed, however, and it has now become an active field of research within evolutionary biology (Tobias et al., 2012, Roulin et al., 2010). So far, much attention has been given to describing the relationship between female showiness or weaponry and components of fitness (Nordeide et al., 2013). However, if the genetic basis of male carotenoid-based traits has so far largely been neglected (see above), the lack of knowledge for females is even more evident (Roulin & Dijkstra, 2003, Potti & Canal, 2010).

The common kestrel is a medium-sized, sexually dimorphic raptor, in which males are smaller and overall brighter than females (Village, 1990). They show a number of ornamental, melanin- and carotenoid-based, colour patches (Palokangas et al., 1994, Fargallo et al., 2007, Vergara & Fargallo, 2011). For example, in both male and female kestrels, their bare parts, including their legs and cere, are conspicuously yellow (Casagrande et al., 2006, Vergara & Fargallo, 2011). This yellow colouration is carotenoid-based, and differs between the sexes (males are more colourful) and is associated with body condition and breeding parameters in males (Casagrande et al., 2006, Vergara & Fargallo, 2011). Together these findings suggest that carotenoid-based ornamental colouration in common kestrels has a signalling function, similar to that found in other raptor species (Martínez-Padilla et al., 2013, Blas et al., 2013). Furthermore, previous studies on other raptor species have highlighted a main role for the environment in mediating carotenoid-based skin coloration (Sternalski et al., 2010), and

Casagrande (2009) showed that skin carotenoid-colouration in kestrel nestlings is strongly environment-dependent, and found no evidence for a genetic component. However, patterns of additive variation in sexual traits can change with age (Robinson et al., 2008), and further work focusing on adult coloration is needed to better understand how sexual selection shapes carotenoid-based coloration.

Here, we provide insight into the quantitative genetic basis of a dynamic carotenoid-based ornament (namely skin colouration) in breeding adult male and female common kestrels, as well as quantify the strength and shape of selection acting upon this trait. First, by applying an animal model approach to data from a long-term individual-based study, we estimate the additive genetic variance component for the chromatic (hue and chroma) and achromatic (brightness) components of colour (Kruuk, 2004). Second, we use regression-based methods to explore the relationship between hue, chroma and brightness of carotenoid-pigmented traits with reproductive proxies of fitness.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area and general procedures

The study was conducted in the Campo Azálvaro region (central Spain), which is characterised by homogenous and extensive grasslands where trees and tall bushes are scarce and most kestrels breed in nest boxes (Fargallo et al., 2009). The study area, covering an area of 22 km² contains 62 nest boxes in which a total of about 30-45 kestrel pairs breed each year (Vergara et al., 2009, Fargallo et al., 2009). From 1994 onwards, breeders and nestlings have been individually marked (see below for more details) and breeding parameters, including laying date, clutch size and the number of nestlings (at the age of 26 days, shortly before

fledging), have been recorded. Adults were captured in the box during incubation (females) or during feeding when nestlings were 10-13 days old (both males and females) and body measurements (body mass and tarsus length) were recorded. At the age of 26 days, we recorded body mass and tarsus length for all nestlings, and we collected a blood sample for molecular sexing (see Fargallo et al., 2002 for procedures). The age of unringed individuals born outside the study area was estimated from plumage characteristics (1 year old vs. >1 year old, Vergara et al., 2009).

Colour measurements

Following procedures previously described in Vergara and Fargallo (2011), we measured carotenoid-based eye ring coloration, which correlates with the coloration of other bare parts (i.e. cere and tarsi) in this species (Vergara & Fargallo, 2011). In 2005, only males were measured, whereas from 2007 until 2012 we measured both sexes. In short, we used a Nikon D70 digital camera (objective: 18-70mm AF-S Nikkor DX) to photograph the eye ring, aiming the camera directly at the eye (i.e. at an angle of 90 degrees between the objective and the surface of the eye), while keeping a distance of 50 cm. To keep variation in light conditions to a minimum, photos were taken under a sunshade in the morning. Digital images were further standardised with respect to light conditions using a grey scale (Kodak, New York City, NY) that was placed close to the trait. Using Photoshop CS3, we selected the eye ring and determined hue (calculated in degrees around a 360° colour wheel, with red set at 0°), chroma (colour purity) and brightness (both on a scale from 0 to 100). Mean hue \pm SE was 44.11 ± 0.18 (males: 43.55 ± 0.25 , range: 38-49; females: 44.42 ± 0.24 range: 36-53), mean chroma was 69.21 ± 0.64 (males: 76.58 ± 0.74 , range: 57-93; females: 65.32 ± 0.76 , range: 32-87) and mean brightness was 71.08 ± 0.53 (males: 71.84 ± 0.93 , range: 55-95; females:

70.68 \pm 0.64, range: 40-88). All colour measurements have been shown to be highly repeatable (see Vergara & Fargallo, 2011 for further details and repeatability).

Selection analyses

We used standard methods to estimate selection gradients, regressing relative fitness, based on either clutch size (CS) or number of fledging (NF), against chroma, hue or brightness (Lande & Arnold, 1983, Arnold & Wade, 1984). We calculated relative fitness by dividing an individual's CS or NF by the mean for that year. We used both CS and NF as proxies for fitness because they may help distinguishing between the different selective forces acting on components of coloration.

In common kestrels, CS is influenced by female condition, which as females are fed by their mates from courtship until halfway through of the nestling period (Village, 1990), is highly dependent on characteristics of her partner (Aparicio, 1994, Martinez-Padilla et al., 2010a). Whereas CS largely captures variation in female fecundity, NF also captures variation in offspring survival between hatching and fledging. This variation may be substantial, as it will be shaped by the environmental condition after clutch completion, parental effort and ability, as well as predation.

As CS and NF are proxies of fitness related to the pair, colour traits (hue, saturation or brightness) of both the male and female were included as explanatory covariates in the model. As shown below (Results – Selection analyses), colour traits were not correlated between males and females. Colour traits were z-transformed to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 for both sexes separately. Standardised selection gradients (β) were estimated

as the slope of the regression of relative fitness against the standardised trait values. To obtain non-linear selection gradients (γ), squared trait values were included in addition to the linear term. The coefficients for the squared terms were doubled to calculate non-linear selection gradients (Stinchcombe et al., 2008). Both directional and non-linear selection gradients were estimated using linear mixed effect models with male and female identity included as random effects to account for repeated measures on the same individual (Husby et al., 2011).

Quantitative genetic analyses

To estimate genetic and environmental variance components for the chromatic (hue and chroma) and achromatic (brightness) variation in eye ring colouration, we first fitted a set of univariate animal models using restricted maximum likelihood (REML) in ASReml-R v3.0 (Butler, 2009). The estimation of the additive genetic variance made use of pedigree information for more than 2700 marked individuals. Siblings from the same brood for which paternal and/or maternal identity was unknown were assigned a common “dummy” parental identity to preserve sibship information (Kim et al., 2013). Mean maternal and paternal sibship sizes in the pedigree were 6.41 and 4.96, respectively. Full details of the pedigree statistics can be found in Kim *et al.* (2013). The rate of extra-pair paternity in our study population as well as in other kestrel populations is below 5 % (authors unpublished data and Korpimäki et al., 1996), suggesting that extra-pair paternity is unlikely to influence our estimates of additive genetic variance of the traits considered (Charmantier & Réale, 2005).

The univariate animal models for each trait (hue, chroma and brightness) included age class as a fixed effect with two levels to account for a difference in eye ring colouration between 1-year-old and >1-year old individuals (see results). Similarly, the sex of the individual was

fitted as a fixed effect with two levels. Finally, date of capture was fitted as a covariate, expressed as the number of days since the 1st of March. In addition to the random additive genetic animal effect (a_i), which uses the phenotypic resemblance among related individuals to provide an estimate of the additive genetic variance, we included a permanent environment (pe_i), which accounts for the non-independence of repeated measures made on the same individual in different years due to constant differences in the environmental conditions they experience throughout their lives (Kruuk, 2004). Finally, a year effect (y_i) quantifies the covariance among individuals living in the same year and experiencing similar environmental conditions (e.g., food abundance, weather conditions, etc.). As detailed previously, some females were captured twice within the same year. In those cases, we only included data from the first capture (i.e. colouration during incubation).

The variance explained by the additive genetic (a_i), permanent environment (pe_i), year (y_i) and residual (e_i) terms (V_A , V_{PE} , V_Y and V_R , respectively) was estimated using REML. Total phenotypic variance (V_P) was calculated as: $V_P = V_A + V_{PE} + V_Y + V_R$. Heritability was calculated as: $h^2 = V_A/V_P = V_A/(V_A + V_{PE} + V_Y + V_R)$. The statistical significance of each variance component was assessed using a likelihood ratio test (LRT), which assumes -2 times the difference in REML log-likelihood scores between a model with and without the random effect of interest follows a χ^2 distribution with one degree of freedom.

Finally, we estimated phenotypic and genetic correlations (r_P and r_A , respectively) among colour components, as well as genetic correlations between male and female coloration. For the latter, we fixed the residual covariation between the male and the female trait to 0. In a last step, we explored genetic correlations between the three colour traits on the one hand, and

the two fitness-related traits on the other (see above). Covariances among traits with near-zero variances were fixed at zero to facilitate model convergence.

RESULTS

Phenotypic relationships among colour components

In males, chroma correlated negatively with hue ($r_p = -0.349$, $P < 0.001$, $n = 104$) and brightness ($r_p = -0.201$, $P = 0.004$, $n = 104$). Hue and brightness were not significantly correlated ($r_p = 0.168$, $P = 0.097$, $n = 104$). In females, hue and chroma were negatively correlated as well ($r_p = -0.274$, $P = 0.003$, $n = 100$), but neither hue nor brightness ($r_p = -0.060$, $P = 0.377$, $n = 100$) nor chroma and brightness ($r = -0.029$, $P = 0.573$, $n = 100$) were correlated.

Age- and sex-dependence of carotenoid-based colouration

Chroma differed between the sexes ($F_{1,176} = 65.76$, $p < 0.001$) and between age classes ($F_{1,63} = 21.09$, $p < 0.001$), and decreased with capture date ($b = -0.019 \pm 0.004$, $F_{1,62} = 23.38$, $p < 0.001$). Interactions among these variables were not statistically significant (all $p > 0.325$). Specifically, males had higher chroma (76.57 ± 0.74) than females (65.59 ± 0.88). Also, old individuals showed higher chroma (71.92 ± 0.67 ; males: 77.23 ± 0.77 , females: 67.50 ± 0.85) than yearlings (64.84 ± 1.79 ; males: 73.63 ± 2.02 , females: 60.32 ± 2.18).

Hue did not differ between sexes ($F_{1,176} = 0.11$, $p = 0.738$), but did differ among age classes ($F_{1,63} = 9.36$, $p = 0.003$). It also increased during the course of the season (estimate: 0.017 ± 0.005 , $F_{1,63} = 13.10$, $p < 0.001$). Old individuals had lower hue (43.56 ± 0.22) than 1-year-old birds (44.82 ± 0.43). Finally, brightness was not influenced by sex, age or capture date (all $p > 0.323$).

Selection analyses.

We first explored the correlation between male and female colour traits, which would be suggestive of assortative mating with respect to ornament colouration. However, we did not find evidence for a correlation between male and female hue, chroma or brightness (Hue, estimate: 0.173 ± 0.129 , $R^2 = 0.229$, $p = 0.187$; Chroma, estimate: 0.224 ± 0.119 , $R^2 = 0.094$, $p = 0.073$; Brightness, estimate: 0.083 ± 0.108 , $R^2 = 0.068$, $p = 0.187$; $p > 0.443$, $n = 74$ in all cases). We found a significantly negative directional selection gradient for female hue when using either clutch size or number of fledglings as a proxy of fitness, whereas there was no effect of male hue. Whereas there was also no association between male chroma and either relative clutch size or fledgling number, we found positive directional selection on female chroma. Finally, there was no association between either of the two fitness components and brightness, in either males or females. For more details, see Table 1 and Fig 1.

Quantitative genetics of carotenoid-based colouration

Univariate animal models combining coloration for both sexes showed significant additive variance for some components of eye ring colouration (Table 2). The h^2 of chroma, after correcting for fixed effects, was 0.40 ± 0.17 , whereas hue and brightness showed lower or non-estimable additive genetic variance (Table 2). We found that V_Y was statistically significant for hue and brightness, but not for chroma (Table 2). In all cases, V_{PE} was low (average number of repeated measures per individual is shown in Table 2).

Intersexual and fitness-based genetic correlations.

We found that the intersexual-genetic covariation of chroma between males and females ($COV_A \pm se$) was 15.387 ± 17.214 ($r_A = 0.461 \pm 0.508$) and not statistically significant

($Z_{\text{ratio}}=0.882$, $p=0.998$). Similarly, the inter-sexual genetic covariation for brightness was 0.545 ± 12.973 ($r_A = 0.316 \pm 8.058$), and again not statistically significant ($Z_{\text{ratio}}=0.042$, $p=0.771$). The intersexual correlation for hue could not be estimated. Finally, we did not find a genetic correlation between brightness or chroma and any proxy of fitness considered. However, it should be noted that all these analyses suffer from low power due to the relatively small sample sizes. Indeed, we were not able to estimate inter-sexual genetic correlations of hue or genetic correlations between hue and fitness because models did not converge. For all details, see Table 3.

DISCUSSION

Combining colour measures of adult common kestrels, collected over 7 years, with a social pedigree constructed over 19 years of monitoring, we report a case of significant additive genetic variance in a dynamic, carotenoid-based ornament in a wild bird. In particular, we show that heritability of the chroma (i.e. purity) of the orange-yellow skin colouration is moderately high (i.e. $h^2 = 0.40 \pm 0.17$). On the other hand, the other two components of skin colouration, hue and brightness, showed very low levels of additive variance, suggesting that their expression is mostly environmentally mediated. As it has previously been shown in other bird species that chroma can be considered a proxy of carotenoid content in yellow traits (Tonra et al., 2014, Peters et al., 2012, Freeman-Gallant et al., 2014), our results reinforce the idea that despite their environmental-dependency (Martinez-Padilla et al., 2010b), dynamic, carotenoid-based signals may have a significant genetic component (Evans & Sheldon, 2012, Velando et al., 2006). This is likely to be mediated by additive genetic variation in those aspects of behaviour (e.g. foraging) and/or physiology (e.g. transportation and or deposition

into tissues) associated with the expression of carotenoid-based coloration (Pérez-Rodríguez, 2008).

As the models used to estimate additive genetic variances included sex as fixed effect, estimates of additive genetic variance of colour traits are corrected for differences in the mean between the sexes. However, although we lack the statistical power to obtain a meaningful estimate of the inter-sexual genetic correlation for the three colour components, it is possible that the genetic architecture of male and female yellow coloration differs to some degree. Further studies analysing inter-sexual relationships (Potti & Canal, 2010), as well as a deeper understanding of the genetic architecture of the trait within each sex (Wright et al., 2007) is needed.

As carotenoids can be metabolized and their biochemical properties can be modified when deposited in fleshy or feather-based ornaments, we cannot quantify the selective forces acting on carotenoid type or level. Instead, we estimated the strength and shape of selection acting upon the expression of carotenoid-based sexual signals. We found that patterns of selection differed not only with respect to which aspect of colour we looked at, but also with respect to the sex of the bird. Specifically, there was negative directional selection on hue and positive directional selection on chroma when using either number of fledglings or clutch size as a proxy of fitness, but only in females. This suggests that natural selection favours females showing low hue and high chroma. Indeed, these two colour components are negatively correlated at the phenotypic level.

Contributing to the long-lasting debate over the function and evolution of female ornamentation (Tobias et al., 2012, Amundsen, 2000), our results suggest that hue and chroma are reliable indices of individual fitness and thus quality in females, but not in males. This might be explained by a fine-tuned trade-off between allocating carotenoids to ornament expression and reproduction (Blount et al., 2003, Blount et al., 2004, Morales et al., 2009). However, when fecundity trades off with ornament expression, theory predicts stabilizing rather than directional selection on the expression of sexual displays in females, for which we find no evidence here (Wheeler et al., 2012, Fitzpatrick et al., 1995, Chenoweth et al., 2006). Irrespective of the underlying mechanism, our results suggest that in a mate choice context, males may benefit from choosing females with lower hue and higher chroma to increase their fitness. The latter is in agreement with the idea that mate choice is more symmetrical than is often believed (Martinez-Padilla et al., 2012).

Our findings are also relevant to the controversy surrounding the relative importance of genetic versus non-genetic models of sexual selection (Qvarnström et al., 2006). We found that eye ring chroma was heritable, and that females showing a more saturated colour (chroma) on average produce more offspring. Hence, choosing a partner with high chroma could provide indirect benefits. Although this would require a genetic correlation between ornamentation and fitness (Qvarnström et al., 2006), for which we find no evidence, the latter may be due to small sample sizes and hence very low statistical power. On the other hand, we did find an association between hue and fitness, but hue is not heritable. This suggests that different characteristics (chroma and hue) of the same signal may support both genetic and non-genetic models of sexual selection.

Conclusion

Exploring the evolutionary meaning of sexual signals requires insight into their potential to evolve, and thus the quantification of additive genetic variances. This has rarely been done for carotenoid-pigmented traits. Our study reinforces the idea that despite their tight environmental-dependence, some components (i.e. chroma) of dynamic carotenoid-based colouration show heritable variation, whereas others do not (hue and brightness). Furthermore, our findings highlight the complexity of the evolutionary meaning of a single carotenoid-pigmented trait when hue, brightness and chroma are studied separately, providing support for both direct and indirect models of sexual selection regarding carotenoid-based coloration. We argue that for full comprehension of the evolutionary meaning of carotenoid-based sexual traits, we need more studies exploring their evolutionary potential in wild conditions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to the Finat family and Juan San Teodoro for their collaboration in our studies. We deeply thank Dr. E. Postma and Prof. M. Jennions for their support, help and collaboration to greatly improve the very first version of the manuscript. I. López-Rull, J. Navarro and D. Lopez-Idiaquez helped in the field. PV and JMP were supported by a Juan de la Cierva and a JAE-Doc fellowships respectively. This study was financed by the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (Projects: CGL2004-04479/BOS; CGL2010-15726/BOS). This is a contribution of the El Ventorrillo Field Station (CSIC).

REFERENCES

373 Amundsen, T. 2000. Why are female birds ornamented? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **15**:
374 149-155.

375 Aparicio, J. M. 1994. The seasonal decline in clutch size: an experiment with supplementary
376 food in the Kestrel, *Falco tinnunculus*. *Oikos* **25**: 451-458.

377 Arnold, S. J. & Wade, M. J. 1984. On the measurement of natural and sexual selection:
378 theory. *Evolution* **38**: 709-719.

379 Badyaev, A. V. & Hill, G. E. 2002. Paternal care as a conditional strategy: distinct
380 reproductive tactics associated with elaboration of plumage ornamentation in the
381 house finch. *Behavioral Ecology* **13**: 591-597.

382 Blas, J., Cabezas, S., Figuerola, J., López, L., Tanferna, A., Hiraldo, F., Sergio, F. & Negro, J.
383 J. 2013. Carotenoids and Skin Coloration in a Social Raptor. *Journal of Raptor*
384 *Research* **47**: 174-184.

385 Blount, J. D., Houston, D. C., Surai, P. F. & Møller, A. P. 2004. Egg-laying capacity is
386 limited by carotenoid pigment availability in wild gulls *Larus fuscus*. *Proceedings of*
387 *the Royal Society of London, B (Suppl.)* **271**: S79-S81.

388 Blount, J. D., Metcalfe, N. B., Birkhead, T. R. & Surai, P. F. 2003. Carotenoid modulation of
389 immune function and sexual attractiveness in zebra finches. *Science* **300**: 125-127.

390 Boughman, J. W. 2001. Divergent sexual selection enhances reproductive isolation in
391 sticklebacks. *Nature* **411**: 944-948.

392 Butler, D. 2009. Asreml fits the linear mixed model. R package version 3.0.

393 Casagrande, S., Costantini, D., Tagliavini, J. & Dell'Omo, G. 2009. Phenotypic, genetic, and
394 environmental causes of variation in yellow skin pigmentation and serum carotenoids
395 in Eurasian kestrel nestlings. *Ecological Research* **24**: 273-279.

396 Casagrande, S., Csermely, D., Pini, E., Bertacche, V. & Tagliavini, J. 2006. Skin carotenoid
 397 concentration correlates with male hunting skill and territory quality in the kestrel
 398 *Falco tinnunculus*. *Journal of Avian Biology* **37**: 190-196.

399 Charmantier, A. & Réale, D. 2005. How do misassigned paternities affect the estimation of
 400 heritability in the wild? *Molecular Ecology* **14**: 2839-2850.

401 Chenoweth, S. F., Doughty, P. & Kokko, H. 2006. Can non-directional male mating
 402 preferences facilitate honest female ornamentation? *Ecology Letters* **9**: 179-184.

403 Endler, J. A. 1995. Multiple-trait coevolution and environmental gradients in guppies. *Trends*
 404 *in Ecology & Evolution* **10**: 22-29.

405 Evans, S. R. & Sheldon, B. C. 2012. Quantitative genetics of a carotenoid-based color:
 406 heritability and persistent natal environmental effects in the great tit. *The American*
 407 *Naturalist* **179**: 79-94.

408 Fargallo, J. A., Laaksonen, T., Korpimäki, E. & Wakamatsu, K. 2007. A melanin-based trait
 409 reflects environmental growth conditions of nestling male Eurasian kestrels.
 410 *Evolutionary Ecology* **21**: 157-171.

411 Fargallo, J. A., Laaksonen, T., Pöyri, V. & Korpimäki, E. 2002. Inter-sexual differences in the
 412 immune response of Eurasian kestrel nestlings under food shortage. *Ecology Letters* **5**:
 413 95-101.

414 Fargallo, J. A., Martinez-Padilla, J., Vinuela, J., Blanco, G., Torre, I., Vergara, P. & De Neve,
 415 L. 2009. Kestrel-Prey Dynamic in a Mediterranean Region: The Effect of Generalist
 416 Predation and Climatic Factors. *Plos One* **4**.

417 Fitze, P. S., Kolliker, M. & Richner, H. 2003. Effects of common origin and common
 418 environment on nestling plumage coloration in the great tit (*Parus major*). *Evolution*
 419 **57**: 144-150.

420 Fitzpatrick, S., Berglund, A. & Rosenqvist, G. 1995. Ornaments or offspring: costs to
 421 reproductive success restrict sexual selection processes. *Biological Journal of the*
 422 *Linnean Society* **55**: 251-260.

423 Freeman-Gallant, C. R., Schneider, R. L., Taff, C. C., Dunn, P. O. & Whittingham, L. A.
 424 2014. Contrasting patterns of selection on the size and coloration of a female plumage
 425 ornament in common yellowthroats. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **27**: 982-991.

426 Giraudeau, M., Duval, C., Czirják, G. Á., Bretagnolle, V., Eraud, C., McGraw, K. J. & Heeb,
 427 P. 2011. Maternal investment of female mallards is influenced by male carotenoid-
 428 based coloration. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **278**: 781-
 429 788.

430 Hadfield, J. D., Burgess, M. D., Lord, A., Phillimore, A. B., Cleg, S. M. & Ownes, P. F. 2006.
 431 Direct versus indirect sexual selection: genetic basis of colour, size and recruitment in a
 432 wild bird. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **273**: 1347-1353.

433 Hadfield, J. D., Nutall, A., Osorio, D. & Owens, I. P. F. 2007. Testing the phenotypic gambit:
 434 phenotypic, genetic and environmental correlations of colour. *Journal of Evolutionary*
 435 *Biology* **20**: 549-557.

436 Helfenstein, F., Losdat, S., Møller, A. P., Blount, J. D. & Richner, H. 2010. Sperm of
 437 colourful males are better protected against oxidative stress. *Ecology Letters* **13**: 213-
 438 222.

439 Hill, G. E. (2006) Environmental regulation of ornamental coloration. In: *Bird Coloration*,
 440 Vol. I (Hill, G. E. & McGraw, K. J., eds.). pp. 507–560. Harvard University Press,
 441 Cambridge.

442 Hill, G. E. & McGraw, K. J. 2006. *Bird Coloration. Function and Evolution*. Harvard
 443 University Press, London.

444 Horak, P., Ots, I., Vellau, H., Spottiswoode, C. & Møller, A. P. 2001. Carotenoid-based
 445 plumage coloration reflects hemoparasite infection and local survival in breeding great
 446 tits. *Oecologia* **126**: 166-173.

447 Husby, A., Visser, M. E. & Kruuk, L. E. 2011. Speeding up microevolution: the effects of
 448 increasing temperature on selection and genetic variance in a wild bird population.
 449 *PLoS Biology* **9**: e1000585.

450 Johnsen, A., Delhey, K., Andersson, S. & Kempenaers, B. 2003. Plumage colour in nestling
 451 blue tits: sexual dichromatism, condition dependence and genetic effects. *Proceedings*
 452 *of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* **270**: 1263-1270.

453 Kim, S. Y., Fargallo, J. A., Vergara, P. & Martinez-Padilla, J. 2013. Multivariate heredity of
 454 melanin-based coloration, body mass and immunity. *Heredity* **111**: 139-46.

455 Korpimäki, E., Lahti, K., May, C. A., Parkin, D. T., Powell, G. B., Tolonen, P. & Wetton, J.
 456 H. 1996. Copulatory behaviour and paternity determined by DNA fingerprinting in
 457 kestrels: effects of cyclic food abundance. *Animal Behaviour* **51**: 945-955.

458 Kruuk, L. E. B. 2004. Estimating genetic parameters in natural populations using the ‘animal
 459 model’. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* **359**:
 460 873-890.

461 Lande, R. & Arnold, S. J. 1983. The measurement of selection on correlated characters.
 462 *Evolution*: 1210-1226.

463 Maan, M. E. & Cummings, M. E. 2009. Sexual dimorphism and directional sexual selection
 464 on aposematic signals in a poison frog. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
 465 *Sciences of the United States of America* **106**: 19072-19077.

466 Martínez-Padilla, J., Dixon, H., Vergara, P., Perez-Rodriguez, L. & Fargallo, J. A. 2010a.
 467 Does egg colouration reflect male condition in birds? *Naturwissenschaften* **97**: 469-
 468 477.

469 Martínez-Padilla, J., Mougeot, F., García, J. T., Arroyo, B. & Bortolotti, G. R. 2013. Feather
 470 corticosterone levels and carotenoid-based coloration in Common Buzzard (*Buteo*
 471 *buteo*) nestlings. *Journal of Raptor Research* **47**: 161-173.

472 Martínez-Padilla, J., Mougeot, F., Perez-Rodriguez, L. & Bortolotti, G. R. 2007. Nematode
 473 parasites reduce carotenoid-based signalling in male red grouse. *Biology Letters* **3**:
 474 161-164.

475 Martínez-Padilla, J., Mougeot, F., Webster, L. M. I., Perez-Rodriguez, L. & Piernney, S. B.
 476 2010b. Testing the interactive effects of testosterone and parasites on carotenoid-based
 477 ornamentation in a wild bird. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **23**: 902-913.

478 Martínez-Padilla, J., Vergara, P., Mougeot, F. & Redpath, S. M. 2012. Parasitized mates
 479 increase infection risk for partners. *The American Naturalist* **179**: 811-820.

480 McGraw, K. J. (2006) Mechanics of carotenoid-based coloration. In: *Bird Coloration*, Vol. I
 481 (Hill, G. E. & McGraw, K. J., eds.). pp. 177–242. Harvard University Press,
 482 Cambridge.

483 Mehlis, M., Hilke, L. K. & NBakker, T. C. M. 2013. Attractive males have faster sperm in
 484 three-spined sticklebacks *Gasterosteus aculeatus*. *Current Zoology* **59**: 761-768.

485 Morales, J., Velando, A., Torres, R., Animal, L. D. C. & Vigo, U. D. 2009. Fecundity
 486 compromises attractiveness when pigments are scarce. *Behavioral Ecology* **20**: 117-
 487 123.

488 Mougeot, F. 2008. Ornamental comb colour predicts T-cell-mediated immunity in male red
 489 grouse *Lagopus lagopus scoticus*. *Naturwissenschaften* **95**: 125-132.

490 Mougeot, F., Martinez-Padilla, J., Blount, J. D., Perez-Rodriguez, L., Webster, L. M. I. &
 491 Piertney, S. B. 2010a. Oxidative stress and the effect of parasites on a carotenoid-
 492 based ornament. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **213**: 400-407.

493 Mougeot, F., Martinez-Padilla, J., Bortolotti, G. R., Webster, L. M. I. & Piertney, S. B.
 494 2010b. Physiological stress links parasites to carotenoid-based colour signals. *Journal*
 495 *of Evolutionary Biology* **23**: 643-650.

496 Mundy, N. I. (2006) Genetic basis of color variation in wild birds. In: *Bird Coloration:*
 497 *Mechanisms and Measurements.* , (Hill, G. E. & McGraw, K. J., eds.). pp. 469-506.
 498 Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

499 Nordeide, J. T., Kekäläinen, J., Janhunen, M. & Kortet, R. 2013. Female ornaments revisited
 500 – are they correlated with offspring quality? *Journal of Animal Ecology* **82**: 26-38.

501 Olson, V. A. & Owens, I. P. F. 2005. Interspecific variation in the use of carotenoid-based
 502 coloration in birds: diet, life history and phylogeny. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*
 503 **18**: 1534-1546.

504 Palokangas, P., Korpimäki, E., Hakkarainen, H., Huhta, E., Tolonen, P. & Alatalo, R. V.
 505 1994. Female kestrels gain reproductive success by choosing brightly ornamented
 506 males. *Animal Behaviour* **47**: 443-448.

507 Pérez-Rodríguez, L. 2008. Carotenoid-based ornamentation as a dynamic but consistent
 508 individual trait. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **62**: 995-1005.

509 Peters, A., Roberts, M. L., Kurvers, R. H. J. M. & Delhey, K. 2012. Testosterone treatment
 510 can increase circulating carotenoids but does not affect yellow carotenoid-based
 511 plumage colour in blue tits *Cyanistes caeruleus*. *Journal of Avian Biology* **43**: 1-7.

512 Potti, J. & Canal, D. 2010. Heritability and genetic correlation between the sexes in a
 513 songbird sexual ornament. *Heredity* **106**: 945-954.

514 Qvarnström, A., Brommer, J. E. & Gustafsson, L. 2006. Testing the genetics underlying the
515 co-evolution of mate choice and ornament in the wild. *Nature* **441**: 84-6.

516 Robinson, M. R., Pilkington, J. G., Clutton-Brock, T. H., Pemberton, J. M. & Kruuk, L. E. B.
517 2008. Environmental heterogeneity generates fluctuating selection on a secondary
518 sexual trait. *Current Biology* **18**: 751-7.

519 Roulin, A., Altwegg, R., Jensen, H., Steinsland, I. & Schaub, M. 2010. Sex-dependent
520 selection on an autosomal melanic female ornament promotes the evolution of sex
521 ratio bias. *Ecology Letters* **13**: 616-626.

522 Roulin, A. & Dijkstra, C. 2003. Genetic and environmental components of variation in
523 eumelanin and phaeomelanin sex-traits in the barn owl. *Heredity* **90**: 359–364.

524 Roulin, A. & Ducrest, A.-L. 2013. Genetics of colouration in birds. *Seminars in Cell &*
525 *Developmental Biology* **24**: 594-608.

526 Simons, M. J. P., Briga, M., Koetsier, E., Folkertsma, R., Wubs, M. D., Dijkstra, C. &
527 Verhulst, S. 2012. Bill Redness Is Positively Associated with Reproduction and
528 Survival in Male and Female Zebra Finches. *PLoS ONE* **7**: e40721.

529 Sternalski, A., Mougeot, F., Eraud, C., Gangloff, B., Villers, A. & Bretagnolle, V. 2010.
530 Carotenoids in nestling Montagu's harriers: variations according to age, sex, body
531 condition and evidence for diet-related limitations. *Journal of Comparative*
532 *Physiology B* **180**: 33-43.

533 Stinchcombe, J. R., Agrawal, A. F., Hohenlohe, P. A., Arnold, S. J. & Blows, M. W. 2008.
534 Estimating nonlinear selection gradients using quadratic regression coefficients:
535 Double or nothing? *Evolution* **62**: 2435-2440.

536 Tobias, J. A., Montgomerie, R. & Lyon, B. E. 2012. The evolution of female ornaments and
537 weaponry: social selection, sexual selection and ecological competition. *Philosophical*
538 *Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* **367**: 2274-2293.

539 Tonra, C. M., Marini, K. L. D., Marra, P. P., Germain, R. R., Holberton, R. L. & Reudink, M.
540 W. 2014. Color expression in experimentally regrown feathers of an overwintering
541 migratory bird: Implications for signaling and seasonal interactions. *Ecology and*
542 *Evolution* **4**: 1222-1232.

543 Velando, A., Beamonte-Barrientos, R. & Torres, R. 2006. Pigment-based skin colour in the
544 blue-footed booby: an honest signal of current condition used by females to adjust
545 reproductive investment. *Oecologia* **149**: 535-542.

546 Vergara, P. & Fargallo, J. A. 2011. Multiple coloured ornaments in male common kestrels:
547 different mechanisms to convey quality. *Naturwissenschaften* **98**: 289-298.

548 Vergara, P., Fargallo, J. A., Martinez-Padilla, J. & Lemus, J. A. 2009. Inter-annual variation
549 and information content of melanin-based coloration in female Eurasian kestrels.
550 *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **97**: 781-790.

551 Village, A. 1990. *The Kestrel*. T & AD Poyser, London.

552 Wheeler, J., Gwynne, D. T. & Bussière, L. F. 2012. Stabilizing sexual selection for female
553 ornaments in a dance fly. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*: no-no.

554 Wright, D., Kerje, S., Brandstrom, H., Schutz, K., Kindmark, A., Andersson, L., Jensen, P. &
555 Pizzari, T. 2007. The genetic architecture of a female sexual ornament. *Evolution* **62**:
556 86-98.

557

558

559 **Table 1.** Selection on carotenoid-pigmented traits in Common kestrels. Results of general linear mixed models estimating directional (β) and
560 non-linear selection (γ) between colouration components (i.e. hue, chroma and brightness) and fitness components (response variables).
561 Individual identity was included as random factor. ** suggests $p < 0.001$ and * $p < 0.01$.

562

Trait	Clutch size		Number of fledglings	
	$\beta \pm \text{SE}$	$\gamma \pm \text{SE}$	$\beta \pm \text{SE}$	$\gamma \pm \text{SE}$
Hue male	0.003 \pm 0.016	0.004 \pm 0.014	0.024 \pm 0.052	0.051 \pm 0.043
Hue female	-0.071\pm0.018**	-0.020 \pm 0.016	-0.124\pm0.057*	-0.059 \pm 0.052
Chroma male	-0.004 \pm 0.018	-0.021 \pm 0.015	-0.048 \pm 0.054	-0.009 \pm 0.047
Chroma female	0.043\pm0.019*	0.021 \pm 0.015	0.129\pm0.058*	0.018 \pm 0.047
Brightness male	-0.015 \pm 0.018	-0.012 \pm 0.018	0.049 \pm 0.053	-0.018 \pm 0.054
Brightness female	-0.008 \pm 0.017	-0.008 \pm 0.012	-0.066 \pm 0.049	-0.027 \pm 0.035

Table 2. Quantitative genetics of eye ring coloration in male and female common kestrels from univariate animal models. The models were constructed as follows: $\text{trait}_i = \mu + \text{fixed effects}_i + a_i + \text{pe}_i + y_i + e_i$ (see text for more details). Models included males ($n_{\text{individuals}}=78$, $n_{\text{records}}=104$) and females ($n_{\text{individuals}}=100$, $n_{\text{records}}=139$). Significant terms are marked with an asterisk and highlighted in bold. Column “Test” denotes the ratio between the estimates of a given variable to its standard error. n.e. means non-estimable

Variable	h^2	Estimate \pm SE	Test	df	F	p
Hue	n.e.					
<i>Fixed effects ($n_{\text{records}}=243$; $n_{\text{individuals}}=178$)</i>						
(intercept)		37.92 \pm 1.63	23.16	1,5.7	801.40	<0.001
Age		-1.00 \pm 0.42	-2.41	1,235.1	5.832	0.002
Sex		-1.15 \pm 0.47	-2.48	1,177.6	6.167	0.001
Capture date		0.07 \pm 0.016	4.38	1,237.2	19.20	<0.001
<i>Random Effects</i>						
V_A		$2.61 \times e^{-6} \pm 4.0 \times e^{-7}$	6.54			n.e.
V_{PE}		0.19 ± 0.84	0.22			0.832
V_Y		2.88 \pm 1.84	1.56			<0.001
V_R		6.74 ± 1.03	6.54			
Chroma	0.40\pm0.17					
<i>Fixed effects ($n_{\text{records}}=243$; $n_{\text{individuals}}=178$)</i>						
(intercept)		84.08 \pm 4.116	20.42	1,11.6	406.60	<0.001
Age		4.65 \pm 1.197	3.88	1,215.9	15.09	<0.001
Sex		15.66 \pm 1.475	10.62	1,187.3	112.80	<0.001
Capture date		-0.25 \pm 0.043	-6.04	1,112.9	36.51	<0.001
<i>Random Effects</i>						
V_A		29.44 \pm 13.81	2.13			0.018
V_{PE}		9.29 ± 12.58	0.74			0.411
V_Y		1.42 ± 1.88	0.76			0.264
V_R		33.26 ± 5.89	5.64			
Brightness	0.02\pm0.05					
<i>Fixed effects ($n_{\text{records}}=243$; $n_{\text{individuals}}=178$)</i>						
(intercept)		68.30 \pm 5.14	13.28	1,6.0	219.00	<0.001
Age		1.09 ± 1.22	0.88	1,234.2	0.782	0.377
Sex		2.94 \pm 1.38	2.13	1,204.9	4.546	0.003
Capture date		-0.01 ± 0.04	-0.30	1,238.7	0.093	0.761
<i>Random Effects</i>						
V_A		2.34 ± 5.06	0.46			0.594
V_{PE}		$2.41 \times e^{-5} \pm 2.97 \times e^{-06}$	8.10			n.e
V_Y		43.79 \pm 26.69	1.64			<0.001
V_R		58.35 ± 7.20	8.10			

569 **Table 3.** Genetic correlations and covariances between colour traits (chroma and brightness
570 of the eye ring) and fitness components (CS: clutch size; NF: number of fledglings) in
571 common kestrel adults from bivariate animal models. n.e.: not estimable.

	$\text{Cov}_A \pm s.e.$	<i>Genetic correlation</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Chroma and CS</i>	-1.120±0.719	-0.673±0.581	1
<i>Chroma and NF</i>	-1.171±1.401	-0.952±4.055	0.125
<i>Brightness and CS</i>	n.e.	n.e	n.e
<i>Brightness and NF</i>	-1.234±1.460	-0.429±0.591	0.059

572

573

574

575 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

576

577 **Fig 1.** Selection on components of eye ring coloration in breeding adult Eurasian kestrels.

578 Broken lines and empty dots denote females, and black dots and continuous lines denote

579 males. We find positive directional selection on female chroma using clutch size (a) and

580 number of fledglings (d) as proxies of fitness. Similarly, we find negative directional selection

581 on hue using clutch size (b) and number of fledging (e) as proxies of fitness only in females.

